Rethinking Education: Matthew Lipman's Pedagogical Model

Peter Paul E. Elicor
Ateneo de Davao University, Philippines

ABSTRACT: Do our current standard academic practices efficiently address the changing needs of modern education? Are our tacit assumptions on teaching aligned with the contemporary revaluation of education theories, understanding of students' competency, role of teachers and pedagogical methods? The well-meaning stalwarts of the "old system" might disagree to apply drastic changes in their usual teaching practices. Yet, one has to recognize that the reluctance to correct dearly-held teaching dispositions, either for convenience or out of sheer rigidity, is itself an indication of an erroneous assumption of the authority of educators. This paper argues that transmission-based pedagogical practices reinforce stultification among students. Following Lipman's pedagogical model, it further argues that an inquiry-based reflective paradigm, which is practiced within a community of inquiry, can supplant the "standard" but less effective academic practices that still find their way inside the Philippine classrooms.

KEYWORDS: Lipman, community of inquiry, philosophy for children, thinking, education

Introduction

The pressing need to improve the kind of thinking in schools is a phenomenon perceived not only by educators but also by the society in general. Matthew Lipman (2013, 54) observes that in today's education "students acquire bits of knowledge that, like ice cubes frozen in their trays, remain inert and incapable of interacting with one another." What students learn is oftentimes fragmented, diffused and, worse, myopic. There seems to be more information but less analysis, more instruction but less

understanding, faster dispensation of data but slower application of values. Apparently, students who can integrate knowledge from different subject areas are few. Most students are more concerned about getting high grades than real-life appropriation of learning. The achievement of academic merits and rankings are more emphasized than practical enactment of principles.

The education system, meanwhile, seems to exacerbate this problem by putting more premium on intelligence test scores, classroom performance marks and academic rankings. It may be true that examination results can predict a student's mental ability to perform well in school, but this does not foretell his/her overall ability to succeed later in life. Howard Gardner (2011, 17) stresses that "tests have predictive power for success in schooling but relatively little predictive power outside the school context, especially when more potent factors like social and economic background have been taken into account." Indeed, there is much reason to be skeptical about the way thinking is being practiced in schools.

Lipman (2013) argues that one of the areas where education fails is the assumption that students learn by simply knowing the answers to certain questions. If one studies physics, for example, it is essential to know the natural laws. For a student of chemistry, on the other hand, it is imperative to master the periodic table of elements. One may be quick to retort that this is precisely the purpose of education, that is, the acquisition of solutions, answers and skills that have been bequeathed from the previous generations of researchers and experts. Although such remark is arguably not entirely wrong, that kind of education, for Lipman (2013, 20), is guilty of a "stupendous category mistake: it confused the refined, finished end products of inquiry with the raw, crude initial subject matter of inquiry." This means to say that the study of the end results is considered primary while the process is unfortunately deemed secondary. Consequently, students become inevitably inclined to commit the solutions to memory rather than intellectually engage in the complexity of the problems under investigation.

Moreover, the way students are taught does not seem to catch up with the demands of the real world since one modality of thinking is favored over

other modalities. A certain "way" of thinking—which is oftentimes linear—seems to dominate the whole practice of education. What makes this worse is when well-intentioned educators are not even aware of the whole plethora of intelligences and modalities that are active, in varying degrees, among students. On this note, Lipman (2013, 197) argues that for the improvement of thinking in schools, the most important dimensions of thinking to be cultivated are the "critical, the creative, and the caring" modes of thinking. Such modalities are best practiced and cultivated within an atmosphere where inquiries are pursued without fear within a community of inquirers.

This article will proceed in four steps. First, I will discuss the conflicting assumptions of the "standard paradigm of normal academic practice" and the "reflective paradigm of critical practice." Second, I will describe one-dimensional thinking as opposed to multidimensional thinking. Third, as a way of synthesizing the points in the previous sections, I will elaborate on the concept and practice of community of inquiry which embodies the reflective paradigm and multidimensional thinking. Lastly, to juxtapose the discussion with the ideals of a democratic society, I will put forward some ideas on the role of critical education in a democracy.

Normal Practice vs. Critical Practice

Lipman (2013, 18) has delineated two paradigms that dominate educational practice: 1)The "Standard Paradigm of Normal Practice" and 2) the "Reflective Paradigm of Critical Practice." The dominating assumptions of the standard paradigm of normal practice are: a) Education consists in the transmission of knowledge; b) knowledge is about the world, which is unambiguous, unequivocal, and un-mysterious; c) knowledge is spread into different disciplines which are non-overlapping; d) the teacher's authoritative and infallible role is essential; and e) students learn via absorption of information.

The standard paradigm obviously refers to the "old method" which values transmission over transformation, memorization over analysis, and regurgitation over understanding. Such method is reminiscent of the

"banking concept of education," which according to Paulo Freire (2004, 72), perpetuates oppression rather than promote liberation. As such, it treats the role of teachers merely as conduits through which preselected and preprocessed data and information are shoved down empty receptacles which are rendered passive and inert by the educational system. Moreover, instead of treating students as independent centers of consciousness, the standard practice precludes critical consciousness since necessary content and procedures are "taught" in a manner of dogmatic indoctrination.

Meanwhile, the reflective paradigm of critical practice are dominated by the following assumptions: a) Education is inquiry-based; b) knowledge of the world is ambiguous, equivocal and mysterious and, as a result, the students' minds are stirred when such knowledge are presented to them in such manner; c) the different domains/disciplines are overlapping and non-exhaustive; d) the teacher is not infallible; and lastly, e) students already have the capacity for thinking, reflection and judgment (Lipman 2013, 18-19).

The basic difference between these two paradigms is that the "normal practice" treats education as a "passing on" of knowledge, facts and ideas, while the "critical practice" assumes that education is, in essence, an activity of inquiry. This difference may sound negligible but it is precisely this difference that crucially determines the outcomes of the whole educational practice. Logically, the goal of the normal practice is to bombard the students with data and information and evaluate them according to the amount of information retained, memorized and repeated. On the other hand, the targeted goal under the critical practice is altogether different. It assumes that absorption and retention of data is secondary to the rigorous discipline of inquiry and the entire skillset that accompanies it, such as, reflexive thinking, awareness of one's implicit criteria and metacriteria and multidimensional thinking. What is given more importance in the critical practice is the aim to teach students to be "reasonably treated in an effort to make them more reasonable beings" (Lipman 2013, 11). The ability to think (that is, to think reasonably well) is generally the long-term goal of education. Though students normally forget the subject contents taken from the primary school,

what is expected to remain is the reasonable thinking skillset that had been supposedly acquired and developed. Nevertheless, the normal academic practice tacitly rejects dialogical interchange, which oftentimes proceeds from the assumption that thinking is one-dimensional.

One-Dimensional vs. Multidimensional Thinking

It may be well to note that there are certain questions regarding human cognition, which include: *How does human cognition operate? What can it know? What are its capacities? How can it be cultivated?* These questions are very important because their answers determine the trajectory of educational practice. Unless they are answered with a certain degree of certitude, one cannot claim efficiency in teaching, let alone authority in the field of education. Indeed, the most fundamental problem in the field of education rests upon our accepted notions of the nature of intelligence, its functions, and characteristics. No wonder some educators practice only didactic method since they assume that knowledge is transmitted from one head to another. Some educators strictly remain within their field of expertise precluding any attempt of the students to "crossover" other domains of knowledge, since their tacit assumption is that bodies of knowledge are fixed and non-overlapping. Some educators believe that what they teach is impeccably true leaving no room for doubt and healthy inquiry, which assumes the infallibility of the teacher's authority and monopoly of truth. All these old fashioned practices cannot just be attributed to the way these educators were trained, but to their assumed notions of what intelligence actually is. As Gardner (2011, 4) notes, the problem lies "in the ways in which we customarily think about the intellect and in our ingrained views of intelligence."

So what is one-dimensional thinking?

One-dimensional thinking is a circumscribed view of human intelligence which assumes that there are only few, if not one, standards for thinking well. Any person who was educated under the standard paradigm of educational practice could fairly recall the subtle pressure brought about by the imposition of certain academic standards that favor only those who can

logically think, memorize, articulate and perform. Consequently, students who have advanced intelligence quotient (IQ) get good grades, approval, and other rewards.

Moreover, one-dimensional thinking manifests every time one demands for clearcut categorizations of certain concepts, arguments and even relationships with other people. Consequently, this tends toward polarization of extremes which already assumes that one is better, truer, and more acceptable than the other. This black-and-white thinking often arises every time one is faced with a dilemma, whether social, political or moral in nature. The binaries of good/bad, right/wrong, moral/immoral and the like, are examples of conceptual extremes which assume a set of criteria necessarily preferring one extreme over the other. Of course, it is not altogether wrong to think in dichotomies. For practical reasons, such thinking helps clarify subtle delineation of definitions, identify one's position, and elucidate implications. However, if such thinking is undertaken for the purposes of skipping the long, painstaking but essential task of mental deliberation and further inquiry, then one-dimensional thinking becomes problematic.

One may argue that at the root of education is the aim to colonize the mind of the learner. While it is true that facts and figures are indispensable in some knowledge-based subjects, this should not preclude any attempt to elevate the discourse on the level of intellectual inquiry and deliberation. A case in point is the Theology course. It is almost antithetical to approach the course without first putting forward certain dates, people, events, doctrines, et al. Nevertheless, it would be equally antithetical if the discussion would simply be a narration of the salvation history and the constant inculcation of moral values and dogmas. One may get surprised of the outcomes if a deliberative process is allowed to dominate the classroom by inquiring about concepts that still remain vague and unexplored. In discussing Theology, one may delve, for instance, on questions like: Why do some people believe while others do not? What makes a moral choice moral? Why are certain teachings of the church contrary to what people actually do in reality? Where does religion come from? Is it possible to have faith in some doctrines, and none on others? These and some other questions may be dismissed as silly and

subversive, but their very nature appeals to the natural propensity of learners to dig deep into abstract concepts that are oftentimes just glossed over, if not, left untouched. Neither the learners nor the teacher may arrive at fixed and definite answers but the important thing is that they practice how to ask questions and think on their own feet. In the process, they will eventually discover their implicit criteria for agreeing and believing on certain concepts, which oftentimes they lack awareness of.

Indeed, much depends on the "cognitive quality" of a classroom discussion (Lipman 1998, 277). One of the main problems of educators is their own inability to recognize the capacity of the learners to think for themselves. What is worse is when well-meaning educators insist on order and discipline to take the front seat of the classroom setting. It is no longer a new idea that such insistence can be "stultifying and can destroy the very spontaneity that they would most like to cultivate and cherish" (Lipman 2013, 14). This is why there is a need to recognize students as stakeholders in the entire learning process. Their role is neither just to comply nor earn grades. They are not passive beings whose task is simply to absorb transmitted knowledge. On the contrary, allowing them to truly participate in the whole learning process, as a coequal, will result to insights that are far more enduring in their application to life situations than would be the case in the transmission of factual knowledge (see Vega and Tyler 2005, 83-86).

One-dimensional thinking is, no doubt, helpful in certain bodies of knowledge that need clear-cut answers to some empirical questions. However, when it comes to matters that pertain to perennial abstract concepts, such as values, norms, mores, human practices, et al., the need for multidimensionality in thinking comes to the fore.

What is multidimensional thinking as opposed to one-dimensional thinking?

Thinking does not simply follow a linear process. There are different modes of thinking as there are different intentions for thinking. Lipman (2013, 201) puts forward three modalities of thinking, namely, critical, creative and caring thinking which must be nurtured in the whole academic practice. Oftentimes, we mistake the notion that thinking critically is paramount,

and therefore should be cultivated by all means. This, however, should not be the case. For Lipman (2013, 201), "one must be on one's guard not to give the impression to students that critical thinking is equal to the whole of thinking." It is for this reason that one must be quick to note that these three modes of thinking should not be construed as isolated and independently compartmentalized since they are in a "continual transaction" with each other (Lipman 2013, 201). Most importantly, these three modalities are best cultivated within the context of a community of inquiry.[1]

Critical thinking "facilitates judgment because it relies on criteria, is self-correcting, and is sensitive to context" (Lipman 2013, 212). Reliance on a sound logical criteria is vital in arriving at judgments that are not simply based on impulse, emotions, or worse, groundless claims. With a clear and unwavering awareness of the importance of reasonable criteria, one would not fall into judgments that are uncalled for. Moreover, critical thinking lies at the opposite of dogma and indoctrination. Since it is self-correcting, it avoids thinking in absolutes. Though logical criteria are, most of the time, universal and objective, critical thinking is simultaneously sensitive to the context in which the criteria are to be applied. In other words, it does not regard rationality merely as an abstract template ready to be imposed on any circumstance disregarding some crucial local conditions. Accordingly, it aims at nurturing a sense of "cognitive accountability" that precautions one from thinking impulsively and unreflectively (Lipman 2013, 214).

Critical thinking is based on reliable and reasonable criteria. It is basically the process that leads one to arrive at judgments that are grounded on sound reasoning. Lipman (2013, 218) notes that "by means of logic we can validly extend our thinking; by means of reasons such as criteria, we can justify and defend it." Hence, critical thinking is not an end in itself. Its aim is to help the mind form reasonable conclusions and judgments on whatever topic that is under investigation. Moreover, essential to the nature of critical thinking is its self-correcting character. Lipman (2013, 218) observes that "we can think about our own thinking, but we can do so in a way that is still quite uncritical." In other words, one could easily justify the mental errors that one commits deliberately or not. Hence, the kind of thinking that is not yet capable of

discovering and rectifying its own weaknesses is still far from being critical. One has to always recognize the fallibility of one's thought processes and outputs in order to avoid making wrong assumptions and judgments.

Furthermore, critical thinking intersects with equally decisive values of creative and caring, which are in themselves, modalities of thinking. Lipman (2013) lists twelve values that are to be found in creative thinking. These are originality, productivity, imagination, independence, experimentation, holism, expression, self-transcendence, surprise, generativity, maieuticity, and inventiveness. These values, however, Lipman notes (2013), do not represent the entire spectrum of creative thinking, but rather serve as a summary of generic values under which other specific values may be included. Lipman (2013, 258) opines that the things that good teachers do to their students are precisely "the things we do with ourselves when we are trying to get ourselves to think." What this means is that in the process of thinking, an implicit dialogue with ourselves also takes place which is symmetrical to the dialogical exchange between a good teacher and a student. Such is the most appropriate paradigm for creative thinking. As most artists and creative thinkers can attest, discovering one's own craft, creativity and medium, involves a lot of trial-and-error, which in the process entails a dialogical trade-off with a good mentor. Likewise, this dialogical movement is constitutive of the very function of creative thinking.

On the other hand, the modality of caring thinking is basically hinged upon the inseparability of our thoughts and emotions. Lipman (2013) mentions several manifestations of caring thinking, namely, appreciative thinking, affective thinking, active thinking, normative thinking and empathic thinking. We often think that emotions have nothing to do with judgments. In fact, emotions are oftentimes considered distractions that cloud one's mind from making unbiased and objective judgments. However, such notion is not entirely true. Lipman (2013, 260) asserts that "our emotions profoundly shape and direct our thoughts, provide them with a framework, with a sense of proportion, with a perspective, or better still, with a number of different perspectives." In other words, if thoughts were altogether separate from emotions, thinking would be a lifeless mental exercise. Note that caring thinking is not a manner of letting one's thought processes be dominated by strong emotions. To care, Lipman

(2013, 261) continues, is to "focus on that which we respect, to appreciate its worth, to value its value." This is why caring thinking does not lose its reasonableness in favor of unrestrained emotions. Rather, it caringly arrests what is being thought while at the same time conscious of its own processes. Hence, caring is a kind of thinking when it performs such cognitive operations as scanning for alternatives, discovering or inventing relationships, instituting connections among connections, and gauging differences (Lipman 2013, 264). By and large, caring thinking is essential in the whole cognitive process. Without it, our thinking is bereft of emotions, valuations and care.

Community of Inquiry

The concept of community of inquiry rests on the assumption that education is best practiced within a group of individuals who treat each other as equal collaborators in the pursuit of knowledge. As an educational model, it aims at inducing the members of the class to be reflective: To engage in reflective reading, reflective questioning and reflective discussion, which is a practice that is "avowedly Socratic in style" (Smith 2011, 52). It is important to note that one of the immediate aims of the community of inquiry is to encourage its members to transcend personal biases and prejudices inorder to objectively perceive and evaluate the matters being discussed. One of the ways to avoid framing biases is by looking out for other alternate perspectives. In a dialogue, "disequilibrium is enforced in order to compel forward movement" (Lipman 2013, 87). Just as forward movement in the act of walking is made possible by constantly throwing one's self off balance, the community of inquiry moves forward by engaging in dialogue whereby arguments are constantly evaluated and even opposed by better arguments until a good judgment is met. In particular, critical questions provide a "stimulus and direction for critical thinking; they move us forward toward a continual, ongoing search for better opinions, decisions, or judgments" (Browne and Keeley 2007, 2). It is in this context that caring and creative thinking become relevant since they seek to maintain the equilibrium among the members and allows for the deliberation of new and creative solutions toward encountered problems under investigation.

It is for these reasons that the community of inquiry is a counter-witness to the usual classroom atmosphere where competition and individual performance are valued and emphasized. Instead, it aims at providing an ambiance that promotes cooperation and mutual trust, and makes healthy argumentation and discussion possible. In a community of inquiry, "students could work together without the fear of failing or disappointing their classmates" (Elbers 2003, 78).

The success or failure of the community of inquiry is very much dependent upon the exercise (or lack thereof) of the three modalities of thinking. A community could not be a "factory for the production of solely intellectual operations, wholly indifferent to or actually hostile to the consideration, respect, and appreciation that the members of the class might have for each other or for the subject to be studied" (Elbers 2003, 202). Without critical, creative and caring thinking, the vey structure of the community of inquiry collapses. This leads to its reversal to the standard paradigm of educational practice whereby the classroom remains a brainwashing factory brushing aside relevant values. This characteristic of a community of inquiry cannot be overstated. The community's emphasis on inquiry and rational deliberation does not necessarily lead to a community whose members become hostile against one another's thoughts and feelings. On the contrary, since everyone knows that s/he could be wrong in his/her ideas (including the teacher), a certain degree of understanding and tolerance will develop. On this note, Lipman (1990) stresses that the community of inquiry:

> [I]s not a community of solidarity where everybody feels the same and has the same ideas and sensations and so forth, but [a kind of community] where there's a division of feeling; there's a complimentary of feeling and of thinking. So they rely on each other, depend on each other. It's very much like a team where there are certain people who are good at passing and others good at running. And they depend on each other; they know they can count on each other. And that's the community we are trying to create.

Such community of inquiry is not normally fostered in the conventional education. What is more emphasized in the standard paradigm is the students' gradual ascent from their own levels to that of the teacher through passive absorption of knowledge and skills. Consequently, this leads toward competition,

jealousy and even antagonism toward the so-called achievements of some students. Hence, the classroom becomes an arena where a student is compelled to prove to others his/her capabilities. The community of inquiry, on the other hand, aims to enhance the students' cognitive skills, such as building an argument, evaluating criteria and responding to certain propositions. Moreover, the community of inquiry goes a little further in that it provides an avenue for the students to develop their creative and caring modalities of thinking. As already mentioned above, it is erroneous to assume that critical thinking *is* the only manner of thinking. As a corollary to the environment brought about by the community of inquiry, certain behavioral skills are inevitably developed, such as "listening to objections carefully, taking them seriously and disagreeing with them without fighting or feeling hurt by the disagreement" (Goering 2011).

Hence, in the cultivation of multidimensional thinking, the pedagogical practice must be patterned according to the ideals of the community of inquiry which abides by the epistemic assumption which Lipman (2013, 197) calls "reflective equilibrium." This means that while a community of inquiry progresses toward learning, the members (including the teacher) must remember that each one can remake, improve, and revise the parts deemed unhelpful and untenable. In other words, each member is challenged to be mindful of one's and other's thought-processes. All these are possible because of the value of trust, whereby students feel free to have their ideas compete (Schoenfeld 1996). Lipman (1990) explains: A "community of inquiry in the classroom can function the way a safety net does to an acrobat. It is there in case you fall. It's there to catch you and to keep you from serious damage. And it does this in the sense that you know that there are others in the same boat and that they feel for you." The community of inquiry, therefore, creates the necessary conditions for the three modalities of thinking namely critical, creative and caring to arise. These conditions, are geared to further advance the higher objectives of education that are in consonance with the objectives of democracy.

The Role of Education in a Democracy

Bell Hooks (2003, 44) is correct in saying that "conversation is the central location of pedagogy for the democratic educator." Any form of teaching that fails to recognize the centrality of a healthy interchange of ideas between and among educators and learners will definitely fall short of the central features of democratic education. The exercise of dialogue within the framework of collaborative inquiry interconnects with the ideals of democratic principles, which prepare students for the procedures of "rational deliberation" essential in a democracy (Lipman 2013, 105). The reflective paradigm of critical practice has more potential to develop democratic-oriented students than the standard paradigm of normal practice. The reason is simple: The standard paradigm, which is inherently patterned from the idea of education as transmission, nurtures docile and passive learners; the reflective paradigm, which is patterned from the practice of inquiry and collaboration, nurtures reflective and democratically-oriented learners.

The community of inquiry as a pedagogical model recognizes the salient fact that teaching human values, such as justice, freedom, peacebuilding, violence reduction, et al., does not thrive in any form of moral indoctrination. To teach children peacebuilding, for instance, necessarily requires moral deliberation that proceeds from an inquiry on the nature of peace and violence. Put simply, moral and ethical values cannot be taught in the same manner as teaching kids how to add and subtract numbers. This is where the community of inquiry as a pedagogical model becomes relevant particularly in a democracy. It makes room for inquiry, wonder and discovery to preoccupy the curious minds of learners. Being collaborative and inquiry-based, the community of inquiry, therefore, has the critical potential to amend the undemocratic and counter-intuitive practices transmission-based pedagogies which are predominant in most Philippine classrooms.

The impact of education in a democracy is beautifully stated by Noam Chomsky in one of his lectures on education. Drawing from John Dewey and Bertrand Russell, he stresses that:

> [Education] is to give a sense of the value of things other than domination, to help create wise citizens of a free community, to encourage a combination of citizenship with liberty and individual creativeness, which means that we regard a child as a gardener regards a young tree, as something with a certain intrinsic nature, which will develop into an admirable form, given proper soil and air and light (Chomsky 2000, 38).

Indeed, the idea that education is like "pouring water into empty vessels" is already a thing in the past and should be rightly kept in the past. Such educational model does a great disservice in a state that embraces democratic precepts. In educating learners within the framework of democratic practices, Chomsky (2000, 39) adds that education could "produce free human beings, whose values were not accumulation and domination but, rather, free association on terms of equality and sharing and cooperation, participating on equal terms to achieve common goals that were democratically conceived." On this note, Freire (2000, 44) avers that "education in the service of domination cannot cause critical and dialectic thinking; rather it stimulates naivë thinking about the world." This goes to say that the role of education in a democracy basically entails teaching and promoting values that run counter with totalitarianism, consumerism and individualism. In other words, learners ought to be constantly prodded to think critically and challenge the implicit assumptions of the status quo. It is not the goal of education, therefore, to produce passive individuals who merely follow and obey authority. Rather, among the essential roles of education in a democracy, is to develop citizens who are capable of making intelligent consent or informed dissent and equally capable of agreeing and disagreeing without having to give up reason and diplomacy. These goals are far from fruition if the education system retains its stubborn adherence to the traditional paradigm of normal practice.

Conclusion

I have argued that rethinking the standard paradigm of normal pedagogical practices entails a shift from a transmission-based to a community-based process of learning. Such requires a reevaluation of the traditionally held assumptions regarding the role of educators and learners, the nature of intelligence and the procedures of teaching. Consequently, this also means a shift from teacher-centered to a learner-centered pedagogical practice whereby collaboration and rational deliberation are fostered which are akin to certain democratic processes. In this context Lipman's *view on education* becomes relevant. He holds that multidimensional thinking expressed in dialogue within a community of inquiry is the foundation for excellent education. He highlights the importance of deliberative inquiry, sense of respect toward other opinions, and the value of reflexive thinking. This obviously runs against the pervasive one-dimensional thinking that has permeated not only within academic institutions but practically in almost all forms of human collective. Such kind of thinking promotes a hierarchy of intelligences in which there is only few, if not one, criteria for determining whether what one thinks or says is acceptable and reasonable. On the contrary, thinking within a community of inquiry safeguards the subtle differences on how different people think differently. Consequently, this kind of education does not simply lead learners to be successful in their chosen careers. Most importantly, it assists learners to think reasonably within the context of a community. It therefore produces citizens who do not merely think for their own interests, but are at the same time mindful that their choices have societal implications. Arguably, these renewed efforts to emphasize education *for* thinking and the role of education in a democracy indeed provide a breath of fresh air in the suffocating halls of normal academic practice. Hopefully, this will usher the necessary and substantial change in the education system that is long overdue.

Note

[1] By emphasizing the equal importance of critical, creative and caring thinking, educators should adopt a model that would best evoke these modalities in a community of inquiry. This is, for Lipman, where philosophy for children becomes relevant. The discipline of philosophy that is suitably reconstructed can be of enormous service even to the youngest school children. What this basically points to is not simply the contents of philosophy, but rather the exercise and discipline of philosophizing, which in essence, is dialogical.

References

Browne, M. Niel and Keeley, Stuart M. 2007. *Asking the right questions: A guide to critical thinking*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. *Chomsky on mis-education.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Elbers, Ed. 2003. Classroom interaction as reflection: Learning and teaching mathematics in a community of inquiry. *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 54, no. 1: 77-99.

Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Pedagogy of the heart,* trans. Donalda Macedo and Alexandre Oliveira. New York: Continuum Publishing Co.

Freire, Paulo. 2004. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gardner, Howard. 2011. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Goering, Sara. 2011. Philosophy for kids: Sparking a love of learning. YouTube video, 10:42. From TedxOverlake. Posted by Tedx Videos, 30 June 2011. Accessed 5 January 2016, from *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7DLzXAjscXk.*

Hooks, Bell. 2003. *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope.* New York: Routledge.

Lipman, Matthew. 1990. Philosophy for children. YouTube video, 56:00. From BBC Documentary 1990. Posted by Pascal Lacroix, 29 March 2010. Accessed 2 February 2016, from *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lp-8lI8h7gg*.

Lipman, Matthew. 1998. Teaching students to think reasonably: Some findings of the philosophy for children program. *The Clearing House* 71, no. 5: 277-280.

Lipman, Matthew. 2013. *Thinking in education* 2nd edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lipman, Matthew and Sharp, Ann Margaret. 1978. Some educational presuppositions of philosophy for children. *Oxford Review of Education* 4, no. 1: 85-90.

Schoenfeld, Alan H. 1996. In fostering communities of inquiry: Must it matter that the teacher knows "the answer"? *For the Learning of Mathematics* 16, no. 3: 11-16.

Smith, Richard. 2011. The play of Socratic dialogue. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 45, no. 2: 221-233.

Vega, Quinn C. and Tayler, Marilyn R. 2005. Incorporating course content while fostering a more learner-centered environment. *College Teaching* 53, no. 2: 83-86.